

The Converted Catholic

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

For the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and for the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

Published by

CHRIST'S MISSION

EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.

Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Director and Editor.

331 West 57th Street,

NEW YORK.

Vol. XXXI.

MARCH, 1914.

No. 3.

CONTENTS

	Page
The Servant's Path (a Poem). By F. F. P.....	78
Editorial Notes—Idolatry	79
Jesuits at Work. From The Vanguard, London.....	83
Bogus Saints. From The Vanguard, London.....	84
Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, XXIV. By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.....	85
Colored Eugenics. By Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D.....	92
The Immunity of the Priest. By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.....	98
Converts from Romanism. From The Christian, London.....	101
A British War Vessel to Convey the Papal Legate from Italy to the Eucharistic Congress at Malta. From The Bulwark, London	103
The Converted Catholic: A Bulwark Against Rome.....	105
Cardinal O'Connell on "The Sacred Thirst of Our Lord." By Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D.....	106
Disavowals Harmful When Misleading, and Incomplete. From The Guardian of Liberty.....	108
The Jesuits in Spain Again Baffled. From The Vanguard, London	110
Why Evangelize Romanists? By the Rev. Charles Inwood, F.R.G.S.....	111
Christ's Mission Contributions.....	111

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year.....	\$1.50	To Ministers and Missionaries.....	\$1.00
Single copy.....	15	Twenty or more copies, each.....	10
Ten copies to one address, per year, each	1.25	Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each	1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Converted Catholic, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. No other acknowledgment will be made of payments in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is unnecessary, and is expensive, laborious and wasteful of much valuable time.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

THE SERVANT'S PATH

In a Day of Rejection

Servant of Christ, stand fast amidst the scorn
Of men who little know or love the Lord;
Turn not aside from toil; cease not to warn,
Comfort and teach. Trust Him for thy reward.
A few more moments' suffering, and then
Cometh sweet rest from all the heart's deep pain.

Have friends forsaken thee and cast thy name
Out as a worthless thing? Take courage then;
Go tell thy Master; for they did the same
To Him, who once in patience toiled for them:
Yet He was perfect in all service here;
Thou oft hast failed; this maketh Him more dear.

Self-vindication shun; if in the right,
What gainest thou by taking from God's hand
Thy cause? If wrong, what dost thou but invite
Satan himself thy friend in need to stand?
Leave all with God. If right, He'll prove thee so;
If not, He'll pardon; therefore to Him go.

"The time is short"; seek little here below;
Earth's goods would cumber thee and drag thee down;
Let daily food suffice: care not to know
Thought for to-morrow—it may never come.
Thou canst not perish, thy Lord is nigh,
And His own care will all thy need supply.

F. F. P., Stanford-in-the-Vale, Berks.

The Converted Catholic

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

Vol. XXXI

MARCH, 1914

No. 3

EDITORIAL NOTES

God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.—John.

All through these articles we have accused the Roman Church of idolatry. Idolatry is materialism, the antithesis of that sublime spiritual worship taught by our Lord, and which all those who confess His name and claim to be His followers should ever hold before themselves as their aim and ideal.

We realize that the charge of idolatry is a very serious one, and we should not make it if it were not substantiated by our own experience and by the opinion of the greatest and most independent men within the Roman Church, who, in all ages and from every corner of the earth, have protested against her abuses. One could hardly make a more insulting charge against a so-called intelligent priest than to accuse his Church of inculcating idolatry, and him of practising it. So we must justify and admire those men who, individually or through provincial or general councils, have had the courage to point out to the Church the evil of her way ever since she went astray from following the footsteps of Jesus and His Apostles.

Needless to say, the Church denies this charge. But let us see if her denial is justified by the common practise.

Through God's providence the writer has seen the inner side of convents and the Vatican, and has also been among the South American Indians, and I can assure my readers that the Church does not use a single argument to defend herself which is not also used by the Indian to justify his position. I have been among Indians who practised what we call fetichism, and when I began to argue with them on the ground of what I had

gathered from books, they laughed at my ignorance. There is no such thing among them as the worship of images or objects with the conception that the image itself has power. Their worship is directed toward that which the object represents to them. For instance, I once saw a whole family of Indians kneeling before an unusually large squash. When I remonstrated with them at the impropriety of worshiping such a thing, they answered that if I thought they were worshiping the squash, I was very much mistaken. They showed me a small, shriveled and worm-eaten squash close beside the big one, and asked, "Father, why is it that, growing on the same plant, from the same ground and with the same care, one squash should be so large and beautiful, and the other worthless, as you see?" To my inadequate answer they replied, "Father, this large squash is a manifestation of God's power and providence. We do not know why He has done this, but we adore Him when He manifests Himself as He has done in this object."

I have been in the temples of the Indians, and after hearing the explanation given by their priests of the use and meaning of their religious symbols, I was obliged to admit that they had better arguments in favor of their worship than the arguments of the Roman Church for the worship of saints. Besides, the Indians themselves had a very poor opinion of the Romish worship of saints and their images. They believed that their worship of God, the Great Spirit, Giver of all things, was far purer than our worship of human beings. Only when I worked upon their credulity, as I felt it my duty to do, by telling them the wonderful stories of the lives of the saints, the miracles they performed and their marvelous apparitions, did they yield. Then all became "converted" and were eager to be baptized. How long their conversion lasted, however, I cannot say, as I was obliged to leave my beloved children of the Nevada; and I have no doubt that as soon as they lost hope of the saints appearing to them and performing miracles for them they returned to their imperfect but more spiritual worship of the Divine power manifested in nature.

Protestants are much mistaken if they believe that the Roman Catholic missionary goes to preach Christ and Him crucified to the heathen. Though he may have an ardent zeal for the sal-

vation of souls, his conception of the way of salvation is bound up with the chief aim and object set before him—the extension of the dominion and power of Holy Mother Church! He preaches that God sent His Son to the world; that the ungrateful Jews killed Him; that He ascended again to Heaven, leaving His power and wisdom to the pope as His representative; that under the pope's direction the world has become civilized, and while all the rest of the world is enjoying the advantages and enlightenment of civilization, they (the poor Indians) are still living like animals in ignorance and savagery. But that God loves them so much that He said to the pope: "Send missionaries to the Indians; tell them that I love them and wish them to become my children; but if they do not listen to your missionaries I will send against them soldiers to destroy them; and if they flee away from the soldiers I will send upon them plagues and great calamities."

Now let us examine the practise of Rome in her churches. That the reader may judge for himself let him go to any Catholic church in New York. He will notice that there is an altar with the tabernacle upon it, inside of which receptacle, which is often very richly ornamented, is kept the host, or the "blessed sacrament." An oil lamp is always kept lighted before it. There are many superstitions connected with this lamp, which are implicitly believed by many devout souls. One is, that if this lamp goes out the world will be left in darkness. Another is, that if the lamp becomes extinguished a terrible noise is heard in the church, so loud as to arouse the neighborhood. It is also believed that when a person furnishes oil for the lamp, in memory of some soul in purgatory, that soul is at rest as long as that oil is burning.

That such stories have produced great effect upon the minds of the devout can be gathered from the fact that legacies of hundreds of dollars are frequently made to the convents for the purpose of providing a perpetual supply of oil for the sacred lamp. Of course, the convents do not spend a penny of such legacies for oil. The legacy of the dead enriches the convent, while the devotion of the living to the host supplies enough oil for the replenishing of the lamp, for the monks' table and even for profitable sales!

In visiting a Catholic church it will also be noticed that, except for a formal reverence in passing before the altar of the "blessed sacrament," the people talk together and are quite at ease. This is particularly the case in European and Spanish-American churches. But if the reader should make his visit on the occasion of the exposition of the blessed sacrament, he will find everything very different. In place of the dim lamp, the altar has at least twelve lighted candles of pure wax and several additional ones, not necessarily of wax. For the "forty hours" twenty wax candles are required. The blessed sacrament is taken out of the tabernacle and enclosed in the *Ostensorium* (remonstrance) and placed on the altar or on a throne, where it is incensed with three double swings of the censer. The slightest inattention or irreverence is considered a sacrilege. When the people enter the church or pass before the altar, they are required to kneel on both knees and make a bow; many kiss the ground after the fashion of monks and nuns. But when the host is put back in the tabernacle and the little door is closed, everything returns to its usual condition. The priest and acolytes return to the sacristy unceremoniously, the people begin to exchange greetings and inquire after the health of their respective families; sweethearts, particularly in Spanish countries where they are not free to do so elsewhere, engage each other in conversation. No one pays any attention to the little object shut away from sight, which they are taught to believe is God.

Now, is this not a ridiculous contradiction? The Church teaches that God is infinite, omniscient and omnipresent, and yet when He is shut up in the tabernacle it seems that He cannot see or know what is going on. A dim light is enough, and His presence is practically ignored. But when He is brought out, then all is splendor, candles, flowers, incense and reverence.

The Roman Catholic, priest as well as layman, has been brought up to believe that the consecrated host has actually been transformed into the substance of the body of Christ, with all His human and Divine attributes and power. Although the worship of the host is an act of gross idolatry, we can excuse the believer in transubstantiation for finding in it an act of true and devout worship, because to him God is really there.

But what shall we say to this which I lately witnessed in a New York church and which I never saw in Europe?

It was at the exposition of the host. Contrary to the custom of the Church, there was an image of the Virgin close by the altar on which stood the *Ostensorium* containing the host. The priest, after incensing the blessed sacrament, turned and swung his censer an equal number of times toward the image of the Virgin.

If the devout Catholic has been taught that God is present in the host he certainly has not been taught that the substance of the image of Mary is transformed into her own bodily and spiritual substance, and the act of worship indicated by the swinging of the censer is therefore offered to the lifeless image.

If there is such a thing as idolatry, should we not justly call this by that name?

There is a great deal to be said in this connection concerning the Church's worship of saints. In our next issue we hope to give our readers a glimpse of the traffic in relics, and how "authentic" ones are procured.

Jesuits at Work

The Jesuits, termed by Romish authority "unnatural workers," are doing their best to stir up strife in England against the young republic of Portugal, complaining of the horrible prisons the Royalists are imprisoned in. The point is, Who built these unnatural prisons? The clerical-controlled government, and as yet the republic, having just thrown over the pope's domination, have not had time to right the numerous ills left as a legacy by the masters of cruelty and immorality. Be it remembered, it is not only the prisons of Portugal that are horrible haunts. What about the terrible revelations of the convents and monasteries? Rome suffered a staggering blow when the immoral priests and pregnant nuns were found out and turned out of their holy (?) houses. Undeniable evidence of convent immoralities were published broadcast in the public press, telling of nuns with infants at their breasts, others ready to take to their beds, priests hiding in underground haunts, resisting the soldiers of the republic with firearms. Do you ask, What has become of these Romish unde-

sirables—the monks, priests and nuns? Some of them are hidden behind convent walls on British soil! Every Britisher should demand all convents open.—The Vanguard.

Bogus Saints

Just recently a sentence of ten months' hard labor was passed upon a Romish bogus saint for fraud at Sarbach, and is reported from Vienna:

"Johanna Jerovsek was formerly a servant girl, and for the past two years she has pretended to be a saint, and on certain days, generally Fridays, she fell into raptures, when she supposedly sweated blood. So great were the crowds of pilgrims who went to her house that the police had to be present to maintain order. Of course, she extracted money from these pilgrims.

"Johanna also pretended to be in touch with the other world. She told the pilgrims that their deceased friends wished masses to be said for their salvation, receiving money for the purpose. This went on for a long time, until it became known that the supposed saint regularly bought calf's blood, which she used for her tricks."

So far, so good, but then ample proof has often been given of a thousand and one similar deceptions on the part of Romanism. The whole heap of Rome's rags, bones and bottles are all rubbish and actually bare-faced frauds. We have seen with our eyes disgusting so-called relics and objects of worship in different parts of the world, generally the means of bringing in large returns to the lap of the mother of harlots. If a poor, ignorant servant girl, trained in Rome's delusions, is sent to prison for her wicked fraud, ought not her dupes, the clerics, to be dealt with similarly? Asked how they could stoop to such trickery, as to deceive and delude poor, ignorant people, on one occasion when we ourselves were present in Jerusalem at the time the wicked Greek priests pretended to bring the holy fire from Heaven, one of them replied, "*We must do something.*" That's it, popery *must* do something that appeals to one or more of the natural senses. Every Romish and ritualistic cleric, from the pope down, every so-called altar, every pretended sacrifice is a glaring lie and standing denial of our once crucified, now living and soon-coming glorious Lord and Saviour. Since the one offering of Calvary God's Word declares, "There is therefore *no more offering for sin*" (Heb. 10: 8).—The Vanguard.

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XXIV.

My dear Cardinal:

The next pope on the list that we should like to see canceled is Valentine, successor of Eugene II. This Valentine has been the subject of many contradictory opinions. Old manuscripts say that he was the son of his predecessor, Eugene II. Others say that "the bishops, jealous of the power of this favorite of the pope, Eugene, spread infamous stories about him, accusing him of having criminal relations with the pope." Of all these we may write later, but what concerns us now is his election, about which there has been great controversy. His name has been removed from the list many times, and afterward put back again. One old record says that he was not consecrated at all, and we know that at least he did not wait for the confirmation of the emperor. He reigned only five weeks, and as he was so young and had so many enemies, his death looks very suspicious.

It is strange that in all the intrigues of the Church, particularly those directed against the popes, your historians always put the blame on the bishops. It seems that the bishops were a bad lot in those days, yet the occupants of the papal throne, as a rule, were former bishops. Bad bishops must naturally make worse popes! Valentine, however, was not a bishop, as one of the charges against him is that he was ordained *per saltum*; that is to say, he received the priesthood without first being ordained deacon. Our desire for a true succession will oblige us to demand the removal of one whose legitimacy is so uncertain.

Gregory IV was the successor of Valentine, and he was elected, according to your favorite historian, Artaud, by the clergy, senate and people. But the fact that the Emperor Louis was obliged to send special ambassadors to investigate the intrigues which brought about his election is sufficient proof that there was cause to doubt its legality. Papebrook affirms that Gregory was of a low and perfidious character, and charges him with hastening the death of his predecessor. We could say much of this pope, but will refrain until we have the opportunity to write of the popes who were "*not very respectable*."

Neither shall we make special mention of Sergius II, St. Leo IV, Benedict III and Nicholas I. There is so much to be said about them that, for the sake of brevity, we prefer to let them be for awhile. Of course, we do not believe their election to have been canonical, as no one who knows anything about the political affairs of that time can believe it. A brief statement of how matters stood will show the reader how impossible a canonical election was. The emperors, in order to maintain their power, offered their aid to the Church, and the Church in return had to promise fidelity to the emperor. In a papal election, of course, only the candidate who was ready to submit to the will of the emperor had any chance. The means adopted to enslave the people to a blind submission to both the will of the pope and that of the emperor reveal that the Holy Spirit had no part in the affairs of the Church.

If we were not already acquainted with the policy of your Church, Cardinal, your invitation to read her history, in order to judge of her Divine origin and power, would seem amazingly daring. But we know that your invitation is the challenge of the pigmy to the giant. He defies the giant because he flatters himself with the idea that it sounds well, and he is sure it will not be accepted. You also counsel your people to read the Bible, but you well know that if any one should go to the confessional and tell the priest that he was obeying your counsel he would be admonished that you referred to persons well advanced in the knowledge of religion; that most people need to know the catechism well before they take up such profound studies as the Bible; that it is necessary for a priest to be several years in a seminary in order to comprehend it; and that being so difficult to understand, the reading of it had better not be attempted at all, or else great care must be taken to study also the interpretation given by the Church, etc., etc. You invite because you are sure that your invitation is not going to be accepted. You counsel because you know that your advice will not be followed.

In Spain, among the peasants, it is the custom when one is eating to invite all the passers-by to share one's meal; but, of course, it would be considered very impolite to accept. Even the little children are taught to say, "No, thank you." A story is

told that a poor, half-witted fellow once gave the customary invitation to a man who thought it a fine opportunity for a joke, and answered, "Yes, I am hungry enough to accept!" "No, no," cried the other, running away, "I need it all for myself. I invited you because I thought you would be polite enough to say 'No!'" So when you invite people to wade through the history of your Church in order to prove your assertions, you no doubt expect them to "take your word for it," and politely say, "No, thank you."

But, certainly, Cardinal, when, having your Church's history vividly in mind, we read the flowery phrases of your apologists and all they have to say about the power of Christianity manifested in the Church and the Divine preservation of her, through all the ages, and the marvelous extension of her power, in the face of opposition and persecution, we cannot help laying down the book and wondering whether the author is a pious *ignoramus*, writing in good faith, or—a rascal. And only an ignorant person could listen with equanimity to your fulsome eulogies of the Church, her popes and prelates.

The truth is that the Roman Church has been preserved throughout the ages by means of human weapons, cunning and cruelty, not by Divine grace or mercy, especially vouchsafed to her. The most perverse and barbaric system could subsist throughout the ages with the means your Church has used at its disposal.

For example, when the Jesuits first went to Central and South America, the number of conversions they reported was marvelous. The way they made these conversions we may gather from the following facts: In the archives of Saragossa is preserved a letter from a Jesuit missionary to his brother, then governor of the city, in which we read: "Here we have to carry guns (*arquebuses*) to defend our lives from the attacks of wild animals and to oblige the Indians to come to mass!"

When I went to Sierra Nevada, Colombia, I noticed that beside the road, not far from our headquarters, was a huge pile of stones upon which every Indian deposited a green branch in passing by. I asked what was there and learned that it was a tomb. Then, thinking only of pleasing the Indians, by honor-

ing in this way the tomb they honored, I made it my custom, also, every time I passed it, to cut a green branch and lay it on the stones. The Indians were greatly taken by my conduct, and no doubt this was one reason for their becoming very much attached to me. Later, when they all had full confidence in me, one of the Indians explained the mystery.

"Father," he said, "we love you because you are very different from the others who have come here. Our ancestors would not have been allowed by them to honor that tomb, which you yourself honor. In that tomb is buried one of our priests whom your missionaries killed many, many years ago. When the missionaries came here for the first time, all the Indians who would not follow their religion had to hide in the mountains to escape death. The missionaries used to call the Indians to mass on Sundays by firing off their guns. They first fired one shot, after a little while two shots, and then three shots. When the two shots were fired the Indians had to run. If they reached the church after the last three shots, but before the mass had begun, they were fined; if they arrived after the mass had begun they were both fined and punished; and if they did not come at all, death was almost certain. One of our priests was very courageous. He came out, and from that tree above the tomb he called to the Indians who were going to mass to stop them, telling them they were doing wrong in abandoning their own religion. The missionary fired one of the signal shots at him, and he fell just where the tomb is, and was buried there."

That is the story of the tomb. A good way to show the Church's spiritual power! A good way to illustrate her providential preservation and the extension of her dominion!

Miracles like this make one wonder why there are still so many heathen in the world.

It reminds me of a celebrated highway robber of Old Castile. On one side of the road, in a lonely spot, he made a tripod on which to rest his gun for surer aim, placed his hat in the middle of the road and brought every passer-by to a halt with the words: "Brother, for the love of God, an alms!" at the same time taking aim and lifting the trigger. Needless to say, no one would refuse to deposit some money in the hat. But if the bandit

thought there was hope of extracting more, he would add: "Now, brother, another alms, for love of the blessed Virgin," and so on, through the calendar, for the love of this saint, and for the love of that, till the poor wayfarer was left penniless. Then the bandit would say: "Now, go in peace, my dear brother, and may God bless you and preserve you from any assault of the wicked!" It was no wonder that he soon became very rich, and that he praised the generosity and charity of the Castilians.

Just so you exclaim over the wonderful Providence that has protected your Church, enriched her and made her powerful!

In this age of enlightenment and progress many find it hard to believe that the mediæval tales of the Inquisition can be true. They think there must be some exaggeration, even in those best authenticated. Yet I am sure that if you should be fortunate enough to see the President of the United States making compact with the pope and surrendering himself and his army unconditionally to his service for the sake of being crowned emperor of the New World, even in this age the Inquisition would come to life in all its old force, and if you lined Wall Street with soldiers with orders to shoot down every one whose name should not appear on the registry of your Church, I believe you would increase by thousands the number of your adherents. And probably many of them would be the most influential men and women in the political, financial and social world.

We have enough proof of this already. Your new policy of boycotting within the law confirms it. You have adopted the policy of publishing in the Catholic papers the name of every business man and prominent citizen who attends any anti-Catholic meeting. Doubtless hundreds will be influenced by this, for fear of injuring their business.

This new development of your Church's policy is not noticed by the majority of our fellow-citizens, who do not see that its ultimate result will be to so trammel the coming generation that no one will be able to make a living in the United States unless he wears a scapular and is able to produce a certificate of confirmation from a Catholic bishop.

I do not wonder that intelligent men of your communion who read the history of your Church and judge Christianity by it

become atheists. I tell you frankly that if I could not see the truths of the Bible and the transforming spiritual power of Christianity except as reflected in the distorted mirror of your Church and her history, I should become an atheist myself. Yet, more, unless I had changed my present standard of honesty, I should feel called upon, for the sake of humanity, to fight for the cause of atheism and offer my life upon its altar if need be.

Your Church is guilty of great crimes, Cardinal, but the greatest of all is that she has destroyed (as far as was in her power) the true conception of God, and of the character and mission of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the power of the Holy Spirit. From this point of view we may justly look upon her as anti-Christ.

In reading the works of atheists, such as Voltaire, it will be noticed that there is a great difference between the real character of the man and his arguments. In their attacks upon God, Jesus and Christianity one can see that, however logical their conclusions may appear, there is something fundamentally wrong about their arguments. The truth is that their premises are wrong, therefore their conclusions are false. Many times, studying the basis of their negations, and judging by their expressed sentiments and ideals, I have been forced to conclude that, had their minds not been poisoned in the beginning by wrong conceptions, they would have accepted the historical Jesus and the true Christianity. What they fought against was really only Rome's interpretation of Christianity and her despotic domination.

You yourself know that the *unity of faith* in your Church is a myth. There are thousands and thousands of priests who are worse atheists than Voltaire. I say worse, because experience has taught me that a lay atheist has still some noble sentiments, something in his inner nature, that makes one feel pity for him; but the priest has no such sentiments, particularly if he is in high position. A certain nun once wrote to me: "I have always heard that the men of rank in the Church have black hearts, but I am finding out the trouble with them is that they have none at all."

Marcellino Menendez Pelayo, one of the greatest of modern Spanish intellects, treats this subject in a masterly way, and in closing this letter I give in substance what can be found in the

Latin documents quoted on pp. 721-736, Vol. I, Lib. III, Cap. III of his grand work, "Los Heterodoxos Españoles."

In 1305, Frederic of Trinacria, in a confidential letter to his brother, Jayme II, of Aragon, says that he has been led to doubt whether the Gospel was Divine revelation or human invention, for three reasons. The first is the *character of the secular clergy*, especially of the bishops, abbots and other prelates who are destitute of all spiritual life and are pestiferous in their influence through the public display of their wickedness. The second reason is the *character of the regular clergy*, and especially of the Mendicants, whose morals and lives stupefy all observers; they are so alienated from God that they justify the seculars and the laity by comparison; their wickedness is so notorious that he fears that some day the people will rise against them, for they bring infection into every house which they frequent. The third reason is the *negligence of the Holy See*, which of old, as we are told, used to send legates through the kingdoms to look after the condition of religion; but now this is never done, and they *are sent only for worldly objects*. We see, he says, that it labors without ceasing to slay schismatics, but we never see it solicitous to convert them. The eloquence of Arnaldo de Vilanova was required to persuade Frederic that all this was compatible with the truth of Christianity, and he undertook to introduce a reformation in his own kingdom, commencing with himself.

These very reasons which caused Frederic to doubt the Divine origin of Christianity have been the fruitful source of doubt and unbelief in every land where Rome has been the exponent of Christianity, and the result has been that either, like Frederic, the doubters have attempted the hopeless task of reforming the Church from within, or they have broken away and plunged into the darkness of atheism, or else—and for this we thank God, who rules and overrules the principalities and powers of this world—some souls, ever true to the Divine spark within them, have found their way out from the thick clouds of Roman darkness into the light and liberty of the true Gospel of Jesus Christ.

If these letters to you, Cardinal, but serve to guide some poor, befogged and struggling soul out into this Light, their purpose will be accomplished.

MANUEL FERRANDO.

COLERED EUGENICS $C_{10}H_{12}O_2$.

BY THE REV. PROF. W. RUSSELL COLLINS, D.D.

In making my compliments to Mr. Coler, Methodist defender of Romanism, I must necessarily be somewhat scattering, for he has written a large book of errors, and in our few pages I can only glance at it here and there.

In some things I agree with him.

Mr. Coler does not like eugenics.

Neither do I! Here, then, we agree. Eugenics is not nice; not even to talk about.

And the Roman Church does not like eugenics. So there we all agree.

The subject, like its chemical namesake, $C_{10}H_{12}O_2$, is too spicy for polite discussion, though it seems to absorb the interests of suffragettes and such-like.

But while we agree in our conclusions, we may differ in our premises.

Mr. Coler seems to be obsessed by the notions that eugenics is a peculiar function of Protestantism and that all "non-Catholics" are inherently Protestants. Here Mr. Coler is not unlike many others in this broad age of broad thinking, and broad doing, and broad talking, whose minds are so broad that they are unable to grasp anything definite, and who never find a focal point, and who are never able to differentiate. In fact, this India-rubber mentality often leads to agnosticism. And what Mr. Coler does not know about the matters of which he essays to be the original elucidator, is sufficient, in bulk, to entitle him to a seat in that school—the school of Know-nothings in history, in ecclesiology, in comparative religions, in psychology, in sociology, in moral philosophy, in theology, in pedagogics, in political economy and in mathematics of the two-and-two rule.

Such broad minds attempt to absorb vastly more than they are able to contain. And in the wide sweep of their strained vision objects become blurred and hazy, as when one tries to look through a powerful lens, held too close to the eye, or out of

focus. The lens may be broad and thick and strong; but the eye sees nothing, though there be a universe within the range of the lens, because the eye is not equal to the power of the lens. Such minds observe general laws so broadly and even try to formulate general laws of their own upon such broad principles that they are entirely unable to observe or comprehend specific laws, or to submit willingly to their government. And such is their breadth of general comprehension that they often comprehend unity in contradiction. They are as one standing in the shadow of the dawning, who knows not whether it be day or night; or as one with vision searching the horizon at sea upon a dull day, who knows not which is sea or which is sky; or as one in a room of bemirrored walls knows not where the room begins, nor where it ends. They see too much, and, seeing too much, see not enough.

So this Colerized vision is unable to differentiate. Being a Protestant, he knows not where Protestantism begins nor where it ends. Consequently he comprehends in Protestantism everything not found in his newly discovered beauties of Romanism.

His inability to differentiate reminds me of an ancient clergyman's round-table story, illustrative of the broad-mindedness of Henry Ward Beecher. A certain New York Presbyterian elder, it is alleged, moved over to Brooklyn and attended Beecher's church. Meeting one of his former New York brethren, he was asked how he liked it over at Beecher's. "Oh, I like it very much," he replied. "When I was at Dr. Blank's, in New York, I learned to love God and hate the devil. But since I have been at Beecher's I have been taught to love everybody, and I have heard so much of the doctrine of love that I have learned to love them both." You see, in his broad grasp of the doctrine of love he could no longer differentiate, and he had learned to love everybody and everything, good and bad all comprehended in one.

I am uninformed of Mr. Coler's breadth of love. Whether, with his new-found love for Romanism, he still retains his love for Methodism and Protestantism, of which it is a part, and so has learned to love them both, though they be mutually contradictory and antagonistic, I am unable to determine. It rather

looks to me as though, in learning to love the anti-Christian Romanism more, he has learned to love the Christian Protestantism less.

But this I do know: That in the loss of his ability to differentiate, he is no longer able to distinguish between Protestantism and non-Protestantism, though he seems to be able to grasp the distinction between Romanism and non-Romanism in lavishing his favors upon his Roman admirers. Consequently, in his laudations of the beauties of Romanism, throughout his two-and-two book, he contrasts all their loveliness with the failures and follies of Protestantism, and comprehends in Protestantism everything under the sun that is not a Roman candle. Of course, his Jesuit and other Roman friends have taught him to do this. For they divide the world into "Catholics" and "non-Catholics," and include all that is "non-Catholic" in Protestantism. So we are given to understand that Christian Scientists, Mormons, Russellites, Spiritualists, Unitarians, Universalists, Anarchists, Holy Rollers, Socialists, Jews, Free-thinkers, New Thoughters, Vedantists, Theosophists, Mohammedans, Black Handers, Apaches, Nihilists, Thugdom, Dowieites, Tolstoyites, Free Lovers, and Babists, and everything else that is not governed by Joseph Sarto, alias Pius X, of the Vatican, Rome, is Protestant. This broad, generous, liberal vision certainly gathers in a multitude of contradictions into one unit.

So, getting back to Colerized eugenics, we find Mr. Coler writing his double-deuce theory thus:

"The two-and-two method would indicate a remarkable resemblance in results between eugenics and what Colonel Roosevelt calls 'race suicide.' I have heard of the marvelous subtlety of the Jesuits, but they could, if they were all their enemies conceive them to be, or accuse them of being or having been, evolve no more efficacious scheme for getting rid of Protestantism than the preaching of eugenics among non-Catholics. A century and a half of eugenics would leave the Catholics in possession of the earth."

By his two-and-two method he should have gotten it up to four centuries. But he seems to have compromised, at this point, on my theory that his two and two make only one and a half.

Here observe his confusion of Protestantism with all "non-Catholics." Of course, by "non-Catholics" he means non-Romanists. This is a very common mistake made by minds unable to differentiate. The only non-Catholics, among those professing Christianity in any form at all, are Romists and a few other small sects of close-unionists who exclude their fellow Christians from their fellowship, and who are not Protestants.

According to this Colerized quadruple theory, then, if the Jesuits could teach the Turks, who are non-Catholics as well as non-Romanists, eugenics, Protestantism would be exterminated. Here, however, there need be no alarm, for the Turks are unlikely to catch and spread the eugenic fever.

My more narrowed observation does not find the seat of the eugenic disease in Protestantism. All sociology is not comprehended in Protestantism. Protestantism is limited to evangelical Christianity as opposed to Roman paganism usurping the name of Christianity. And however much certain faddish sociologists may advocate the teachings of eugenics, eugenics have nothing to do with Divine law nor with evangelical Christianity.

By eugenics is meant the artificial breeding of babies, upon such principles as are in vogue in the breeding of blooded stock, such as horses, dogs, cows, pigs, etc., as opposed to the reproduction of the race according to the natural law.

Theoretically, eugenics means better babies; though in certain recent baby exhibits very non-eugenic babies, and even foundlings have carried off prizes as perfect specimens. I have found eugenic dogs very hard to raise and utterly lacking in endurance and often rather stupid. And I have found little mongrels to be strong and hardy and bright with intelligence. So the eugenic theory is not always operative. Mate as you may and a genius may be born of fools. And certainly all fools are not of fool parentage. Nature's way usually proves superior to the way of eugenics.

But eugenics means fewer babies, in the elimination of the inferior. This is race suicide and is not taught in Protestantism.

Now, of course, Rome is opposed to eugenics. For any adoption of eugenic laws by the State would govern Rome as well as

non-Romanists. And fewer babies means ultimately fewer Peter's pence at the Vatican. So down with eugenics! Rome's very bread and butter, and the sugar on the top of the butter, demand that Rome shall cry out against eugenics.

Protestantism levies no Peter's pence, and looking to the Lord for support is not so greatly concerned with pence, and is therefore unconcerned with this particular aspect of eugenics.

Eugenics means, theoretically at least, perfect babies. Now, this would never do, in Rome.

Perfection in babies includes mental as well as physical perfection. And perfect mentality would soon disrupt the whole Roman system. Figuring Mr. Coler's two and two backward, Protestants could adopt no better plan for the destruction of Romanism than to teach eugenics to Romanists. Perfect mentality, among Romanists, would throw St. Ann's shin bone into the garbage heap with the rest of the leavings of the butcher shop; and St. Rita's shin bone would be tossed in after it, and some of the shin-bone priests would have to go to work to earn an honest living. Eugenics, developing perfect mentality, would close up Lourdes and put the lid down tight on other Roman swindling joints and catch-penny fakes. It would empty nunnery slave pens and monasteries. It would spill the holy water, which is horribly uneugenic, scatter incense, smash images, melt down Roman candles, "bust up" the confessional, empty purgatory free of cost and leave the poor saints penniless at their deserted shrines. Give us an eugenic pope—well, that would be impossible, for these two words do not fit together. To be pope, one could not be eugenic. And to be eugenic, one could not be pope. For no man of perfect mentality could ever fancy himself to be God, or to be infallible in any way, or to be sovereign ruler over Heaven, earth and hell. Even a half-sane man knows that the smallest devil in hell is more of a sovereign than any pope or than any ruler born of human flesh, however eugenic. So there cannot be an eugenic pope nor an eugenic Romanist. And inasmuch as Rome must have Romanists, Rome cannot have eugenics. *Ergo*, down with eugenics!

But Mr. Coler says, "A century and a half of eugenics would leave the Catholic Church alone in the field." Tush! Mr. Coler!

Down to the foot of the class! You have done your sum wrong. You are talking more Coleristic nonsense. Divide your answer by three, and say, a half a century of eugenics, and there wouldn't be any Roman Church. As things are going in all the old strongholds, there will not be much of a Roman Church in half a century, anyhow, eugenics or no eugenics. And a century and a half of eugenics, and there wouldn't be any field. For in that time, under applied eugenics, the whole race will peter out. The full development of eugenic law would depopulate the world. It means, as you agree, Mr. Coler, race suicide, most effectively. Here we agree, Mr. Coler. But you are wrong in your mathematics when you put the blame upon Protestantism and credit Romanism with a disinterested, benevolent and righteous protest.

This is not a treatise upon eugenics, beyond the point of exhibiting the absurd Mr. Coler in his Coleristic absurdities.

But I will pause to remark that it seems to be a part of the Divine plan that babies shall be born into the world until God has completed the race. And these babies all have immortal souls, of vastly greater value than the frail bodies they temporarily inhabit. If God chooses to give an immortal soul a frail earthly habitation, a weak body of flesh, perhaps a diseased body, that is His business. I think He knows His business. I would rather have my imperfect body with my future eternal inheritance for my soul than to have been deprived of body, soul and existence by some fool-eugenist. I am glad there were no eugenics before I was born; for if there had been, they would have wiped me off the slate and I wouldn't be making a fool of Mr. Coler at this moment. I rather guess Mr. Coler wouldn't have been around anywhere either. Maybe that's why he does not like eugenics, for he, with his curious mentality, would surely have been a part of the race suicide.

So, if not in premises, at least in conclusion, I agree with Mr. Coler on the subject of eugenics that the fad is iniquitous, a defiance of God, in this brilliant age when men know more than God, or think they do, and when they venture to rewrite Divine law.

We shall see more of Mr. Coler later.

THE IMMUNITY OF THE PRIEST

BY BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D. D.

Let it be understood that the Roman Church never abdicates any right she has once enjoyed. She may tolerate infringement because of times and circumstances, but she deprecates the necessity of it in the pulpit and the confessional. Her followers are taught that no good Catholic can lawfully make use of her toleration, as it is simply "*vitanda pejora*" (to avoid worse evils) from her enemies. When missionaries go to a non-Catholic country they are furnished with the power to dispense with such things as may interfere with the progress of their mission. When the first Jesuits went to India and Japan, they even asked the pope's permission to dress as the priests of those countries did. Such special permissions last only as long as circumstances make them necessary. But the canons remain the same. In this country images and relics were greatly restricted, as well as the wearing of the priestly garb on the streets. Now circumstances have changed. Through the influence of Rome upon the ritualists, images have been introduced into some Protestant churches, to be followed by more and more in the Catholic churches; people have become accustomed to them, and very soon we may see them carried in procession through the streets, just as they are in old Seville!

The *Ne temere* decree and the *Motu proprio* are nothing new. They are both very old. There is no Roman theology, old or new, which does not make *disparitas cultu* (disparity in religion) an impediment to marriage which annuls the bond, if made in spite of it. If it was not established in this country before, it is because the Church did not consider it feasible. But there has been nothing to prevent a Spaniard who came to this country and married a Protestant girl from going back to Spain with his or her American money and marrying a Catholic girl there. He can do so now, and I know of several who have done it.

The Church has fought for the immunity of the priest ever since she established her hierarchy. *In foro externo* she had to submit to the civil law, but *in foro interno* she has always bound her subjects to comply with it. If this law of the immunity of priests was not given before to the public, it is only for the reasons above stated that the Church feels her way very carefully

but surely. Now the Roman hierarchy have made an attempt to see how far they can go. Cardinal Merry del Val has issued a letter to all the bishops of this country, asking them to report to him the effect produced by the *Motu proprio*, and the results of the *Ne temere*. Should all the bishops report that although these decrees met with great opposition at the beginning, it has died away, another attempt will follow to go a step further. That the reader may have an idea of this *Motu proprio*, we give the text as translated from the "*Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*," the official organ of the Vatican. It is as follows:

"Transactions of the Apostolic See. Official Memorandum.

"Of our own motion, Concerning bringing clergy before the tribunals of lay judges. Though all diligence be employed in framing laws, it is often impossible to guard against every doubt which may subsequently arise owing to adroit interpretation of the same. Sometimes, moreover, on the part of jurists who have undertaken to investigate the nature and force of a law, there are such contrary opinions that what has been settled by law cannot be otherwise ascertained than by an authoritative pronouncement. This has happened after the promulgation of the ordinance of the Apostolic See limiting *censura latæ sententiæ*, for among writers who have expounded that ordinance a great dispute has arisen concerning section 7, namely, whether the word 'compelling' applies only to legislators and public persons, or whether it applies also to private individuals who, by appealing to a lay judge or bringing an action before the latter, may 'compel' the lay judge to bring a member of the clergy before his tribunal. Doubtless the meaning of this section has been repeatedly declared by the Congregation of the Holy Office. But now in these times of injustice, when so little regard is paid to the immunity of ecclesiastics that not only clerics and priests, but also bishops and even their eminences the cardinals, are brought into a court of laymen, the case altogether demands from us that, by the severity of the punishment, we keep to their duty those men who are not deterred from an act of such sacrilege by the gravity of their offence. Therefore, we, of our own motion, do ordain and decree as follows:

"Whenever private individuals, whether of the laity or in holy orders, men or women, summon to a tribunal of laymen any ecclesiastical persons, whatever be the case, criminal or civil, without any permission from an ecclesiastical authority, and constrain them to attend publicly in these courts—all such private individuals incur excommunication at the hands of the Roman pontiff.

"Moreover, it is our will and pleasure that what has been ordained in these letters be established and ratified, notwithstanding anything whatever to the contrary.

"Given at Rome at St. Peter's on the ninth day of the month of October, in the ninth year of our pontificate. Pope Pius X."

What was the origin of the immunity of the clergy? This is a question which brings forth a great diversity of answers from the jurists.

All the Catholic jurists agree that the clergy are immune by Divine right and exempt from secular jurisdiction in all things pertaining to their sacred office, but as to their immunity in things temporal there is great disagreement.

Some trace back to the priesthood of the Old Testament, of which the Roman priesthood claims to be a continuation, the origin of the absolute immunity of the Church and everything that belongs to it, as also of the priest and all his possessions. And they confirm this argument by the passage in Matthew 17: 24-26, where the saying of Jesus that the *sons* should not be required to pay tribute is interpreted as referring to the clergy. They also make use of the argument of authority, *i. e.*, that spiritual authority is above temporal authority, the latter being only an outgrowth of the former. The priest, by virtue of his calling and ordination, is, therefore, superior to any temporal authority, be it that of king, president or judge, and cannot be made subject to such authority.

They hold that, although their immunity was not acknowledged during the first centuries of the Church's history by the pagan emperors, when Constantine and the other Christian emperors who succeeded him did concede it to the clergy, it was not as though they were granting any new privilege, they were simply restoring to them their divinely established right. They also affirm that in the canons and councils of the Church, from that time up to the time of the Tridentine Council, she has never begged any favor from the secular power, she has only demanded to be allowed the enjoyment of her rights.

The opposing school maintains that the priest in matters pertaining to his spiritual character and ministry, being attached to the Church, is exempt from any secular jurisdiction; but that, on the other hand, being a member of society, he is bound to comply with the laws of society, and, therefore, in temporal affairs he is under the jurisdiction of the civil law. Special concessions made with respect to the persons and temporal possessions of the clergy were not rights inherent to their office, but favors bestowed upon them by the emperors. But the sustainers of this opinion have always been secular jurists or some few clerical authors, looked upon with suspicion by the Church.

That the Church in this twentieth century has not changed her

views on the subject and that she claims absolute immunity, not only for the person of her clerics but also for possessions, is proved by the persistent efforts she is always making everywhere to that end, and by the pope's express declaration contained in the above *Motu proprio*, which forbids any other interpretation and exempts the priests from secular jurisdiction. Any person who denounces or brings to the civil courts any member of the clergy, whatever may have been his crimes, is under pain of excommunication reserved especially to the pope.

In this series of articles we purpose to present practical cases illustrating the effect of this doctrine upon the life and morals of a people where the public authorities may be defrauded and defeated. But that the reader may fully understand how frequently and easily this may be done, even by persons whose integrity and high character in other matters are unquestioned, we will give the reason or argument advanced by the Church in her own justification:

As the Church claims that by Divine right she, her priests and her possessions, should be exempt from all civil authority, it follows that any government which restricts her rights is a usurper, and any means she may employ for the recovery of her rights is lawful. It is as if a thief should steal from you a sum of money. If you should have the opportunity of recovering the whole or a part of it, it would be lawful. All that is required of you is to exercise such care and prudence as to avoid his knowledge or interference.

CONVERTS FROM ROMANISM

The Protestant Alliance

Remarkable testimonies of conversion from Romanism were given, at the Queen's Hall, in connection with the twenty-second annual rally of the Protestant Alliance. Mr. A. C. Craine, M. P., presided, and heartily welcomed, in the name of the Alliance, those who had left the errors of Romanism and had braved much malignant persecution for the sake of Christ. Speaking of the insidious encroachments of Romanism in our land, he voiced a stirring appeal to all Protestants to exercise increased vigilance, and to show stronger determination to preserve intact the faith handed down to them.

Brother Ansgar, a converted Marist monk, spoke of his work among Roman Catholics. He had undergone much persecution, and had experienced many vicissitudes. At times he had been in danger of his life from Romanist fanatics, and at Dumfries, especially, he had met with insult and difficulty. On the other hand, there had been blessed results in the freeing of many souls from the chains of Romish error.

Mrs. Young gave a graphic account of her life, especially in relation to her religious experience. She was born in Ireland, and trained from her earliest years in the tenets of Roman Catholicism. From an early age she was seized with a strong desire to serve God, and it became her ambition to enter a convent. She lived for some time in India with her father, who, strict Roman Catholic though he was, strongly opposed her idea of conventual life; and eventually, in response to his dying request, she abandoned that ambition. She married a Presbyterian, and, in obedience to her priest's command, labored hard to win him to her faith. Eventually she succeeded, and soon after returned with her husband to Edinburgh. There, partly from curiosity, she attended a Baptist chapel, finding such teaching of God and His Word as she had never had before—a teaching that led her at last into the pure, simple faith of the Gospel.

Speeches were also given by Brother Mathew, who told of his experience of and escape from the miseries of monastic life; by M. Giuseppe Bonugli, an Italian who from gross ignorance of things spiritual had risen to a true knowledge of Christ; and by Mr. Edward Thornbury, a convert from Romanism, an able worker in the cause of Protestantism, at Liverpool, and secretary of the Converted Romanists' Prayer Union. The testimonies were characterized by a note of trust in God, in spite of persecution, and by the sense of a great message to be proclaimed; as one of the speakers said: "The Lord has given me a mission."

Rev. R. K. Mackay, F.R.G.S., of the Paris City Mission, and Mrs. Henry Fowler also took part in the meeting; and at a later gathering addresses were given by Mr. Michael J. F. McCarthy, Dr. Harry Grattan Guinness and other friends.—The Christian, London.

A BRITISH WAR VESSEL TO CONVEY THE PAPAL LEGATE FROM ITALY TO THE EUCCHARISTIC CONGRESS AT MALTA

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, D.D., VENICE.

Italy is greatly amazed and indignant, and Malta is perplexed and indignant too, that a British vessel, the "Hussar," under Lieutenant and Commander N. W. Diggle, should have received orders to go to Syracuse, in Sicily, and embark the papal legate, Cardinal Ferrata, and convey him to Malta, that he may attend the Eucharistic Congress which is to be held there this month. Every one is asking, What has the British Admiralty to do with a Eucharistic Congress? And what right has the British Admiralty to send a vessel to an Italian port to take off the ambassador of the pope and the Vatican? If any nation has the right so to honor a representative of the pope it is Italy. The pope and the cardinal legate are Italian subjects, and the Roman Catholic Church is still unhappily the established Church of the country. But Italy does not move in the matter. Italy would not move in the matter. Italy would not put at the service of such a man, to go on such a mission, the veriest cockleshell of a boat in the land. And why? Because she considers it entirely out of place for the State to become the servant of the Church. Because she knows that pope and cardinal and priest and papal ecclesiastics of every kind are all the enemies of liberty and education and of everything that tends to the happy, wholesome life of the people. And Italy knows what a Eucharistic Congress means. It means a congress got up to deepen in the minds of ignorant and superstitious people the scandalous imposture of transubstantiation. On that imposture rests all the power of the priest, for it turns the mass into a sacrifice and turns the celebrant into a sacrificial priest, and so enables him to say to the people, "Only through my mediation and sacrifice can you find pardon and acceptance with God. For your salvation it is necessary that I offer these masses, these sacrifices." Therefore the Romish priest obtains an extraordinary power over his victim. He has him in his grip. And as masses must be paid for, in this way he gets money for the living and the dead.

Destroy this superstition, this imposture, and, like Samson shorn of his locks, the priest becomes weak as another man. And many influences are at work to destroy it. Education, a man's better judgment, his common sense, the ridicule of men, the skepticism of the priests themselves, many of whom know that they are only imposing on the people, and too often show it by their characters and lives. Therefore means must be adopted to keep the superstition alive. At one time palpable lies were told, mock miracles were got up. In the cathedral of Orvieto, in the chapel of the "Corporale," may be seen a cloth with blood-stains on it. I saw it some years ago. It is preserved in a huge box of solid silver. What is the story connected with it? In 1263 the priest of Bolsena, a neighboring village, was, it is said, an unbeliever of transubstantiation. But as he broke the wafer at mass one day it became flesh in his hands, and blood dropped from it on to the altar-cloth. Pope Urban IV was at once advised of the "miracle," and gave orders to preserve the cloth, and get built a cathedral with a special chapel to receive it. This, then, is the cloth that lies in the silver box. At Padua I saw a picture of a donkey kneeling before St. Anthony, who held a piece of consecrated bread in his hand. The story is that the driver of the donkey said that he no more believed in transubstantiation than his donkey did. Thereupon St. Anthony presented the wafer to the donkey, when it instantly recognized it by kneeling down. These are examples of what used to be done to bolster up the transubstantiation fraud in the interests of a greedy priesthood and a worldly Church. As these "pious frauds" can hardly be resorted to in these days, Eucharistic Congresses are got up to take their places, to serve the same purpose. Italy, then, a nominally Roman Catholic country, has too much self-respect to do anything to countenance such doings.

And yet here we have Protestant, Christian England (if we may still speak of her as such), which owes all her life, all her prosperity, all her greatness, all her happiness to her Protestantism, to her having been mercifully delivered from papal superstition and imposture, deliberately going out of her way to aid and abet the papal Church in fastening the elements of human degradation upon her own subjects in Malta. England has enough to answer for in maintaining in that wretched island men

and women in a state of ignorance and immorality that would shame a pagan land, without this further gratuitous procedure in order to make them still more wretched and debased. Besides the evil such an action is doing to Malta, it is damaging to England herself. England's prestige among the nations of Europe is low enough at present without the Admiralty doing acts to lower it yet more. Yes, and we are offending Italy as well. Italy has always been our stanch friend, and Italy has always counted on our friendship. But of late we have, in the interests of religious and political despotism, done not a little to offend her, and now, by sending this ship to her shores on such an errand, we show how little we care for her struggles for freedom against the intrigues of the Vatican, and how ready we are to countenance and befriend her enemy, the papal Church.

The action of the British Government and the Admiralty in this matter is indefensible, it is unprincipled, and it is suicidal as well as grossly offensive to a friendly power. It is surely high time that men, weak enough, or wicked enough, to do such actions, should be cleared out of the Government. Until we have men of Christian character, and men true to Protestantism in our places of honor and power, there is little hope of England recovering her place of influence among the nations of the world.—The Bulwark.

The Converted Catholic a Bulwark Against Rome

My dear Mr. Collins:—I got the December number of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC and read some time ago your good article in reference to our President's deserting his own church service at a time when he had such good cause to thank the God of his Fathers, and spending that time in admiring the spectacle of a mass. I gave some ten or more numbers of the magazine to a young friend of mine who was under a priest's instruction and headed straight for Romanism, and they, with some good talks we had, turned him about face. He is now absolutely safe from Rome, and, I think, earnestly seeking his Saviour. Best wishes in the good work.

Yours most truly,

A LAWYER.

CARDINAL O'CONNELL ON "THE SACRED THIRST OF OUR LORD"

A Boston newspaper publishes "Lenten Regulations," issued by Cardinal O'Connell.

Of course, the Boston newspaper would deny that it has become the cardinal's parish record or diocesan journal.

As they are much the same, as usual, these Lenten regulations call forth little comment that has not already repeatedly been made. The rules seem to be more indulgent than formerly, however, and provide many loop-holes through which escape from much fasting may be made. In America, Romanists seem to know how to cheat the Church and to gain credit for obedience at the same time. And the Vatican must wink one eye and say nothing, for the Vatican needs America and American coin.

I once knew two Roman servants. One fasted strictly and her Protestant mistress remonstrated with her for not taking enough food to sustain her strength for her work, for which she was receiving pay in Protestant money. This honest girl was shocked when she saw her neighbor eating breakfast, to her complete satisfaction. But the less honest, yet more sensible girl, explained it thus: "The priest says I must eat only one-fourth the usual amount. Now I am very hungry and I could eat four big slices of bread and drink four cups of coffee. But I am eating only one big slice of bread and drinking only one cup of coffee." So she obeyed the Church and satisfied her appetite by a little stretch of conscience.

I think Cardinal O'Connell's regulations allow for a considerable stretch of conscience. He limits fasting to those over 21 and under 60 years of age, and excuses those in delicate health, etc. "Delicate health" would excuse a multitude. But the cardinal looks like a good liver and he is no doubt very sympathetic.

I am particularly interested in the regulation of the last clause under his seventh head, in which the cardinal directs that

"Abstinence from all intoxicating drinks in honor of the sacred thirst of our Lord is especially commended."

Note, he says "commended," not commanded. That lets the cardinal out if he does not wish to deprive himself. But I should

say that it is a good thing for even cardinals to quit drinking for a little while now and then, out of Lent as well as during Lent. Let us hope that Cardinal O'Connell intends to set a good example for his subjects. I wonder whether Father Phelan agrees with this commendation!

Cardinal O'Connell might well advance a step in assisting the faithful to attain this commendation, by closing all the Roman Catholic saloons during Lent, for most of them are Roman Catholic. But perhaps that would be asking too much, for it might seriously interfere with poor Peter's pence, and the Vatican must have pence. Anyhow this commendation is only a loop-hole, and the whiskey will be sold and drunk as freely as usual in Boston and elsewhere.

But while the cardinal's commended temporary reformation in the drink habit is truly commendable, his estimate of our Lord is most shocking.

Does the cardinal think that our blessed Lord was such an one as perhaps himself, to have a thirst for intoxicating drink? Was our Lord yearning for whiskey? And is this what the cardinal calls a "sacred thirst"? If "the sacred thirst" be this, then no doubt it must be a function of the sacred office of the Cardinalate to indulge freely in satisfying this "sacred thirst" in other times than Lent. And is this why the saloon business commands the keen interest of so many Romanists, both before and behind the bar—because of its sacredness? Just think of it! Holy sacred thirst! Sacred intoxicants! Sacred whiskey! Sacred rum! Sacred saloons! Sacred, doubly sacred drunkards! For the more the thirst, the more the sacredness! The Mohammedans and the Mormons have sacred brothels. And now the Romanists have sacred saloons, if we can accept the cardinal's interpretation of "the sacred thirst." Is that why priests sometimes get upon a sacred drunk, and tread the "primrose path of dalliance," in consequence?

We must conclude that, either the whiskey bottle and the little black jug are divine institutions, or that O'Connell is an outrageous blasphemer.

But why did the cardinal not go a step further, to the legitimate conclusion, and advise that all his Roman whiskey drinkers should drink vinegar during Lent. **There** would be something like real penance in that.

W. RUSSELL COLLINS.

DISAVOWALS HARMFUL WHEN MISLEADING AND INCOMPLETE

At the convention of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, August 11, 1913, Archbishops Ireland, of St. Paul, Minn., and Keane, of Dubuque, Iowa, delivered addresses, which to some other members of the hierarchy did not seem to ring true from the Catholic standpoint.

One person in particular remembering the official, infallible utterances of Pope Pius IX and Pius X, took the archbishops to task for forgetting themselves so culpably, and he boldly, frankly and publicly condemned their attitude in an editorial appearing in the "Morning Star" (R. C.) of New Orleans, August 16, 1913. The following is quoted from the editorial:

"It is unfortunate, therefore, that during the convention, which has just come to a close in Milwaukee, some among those who ought to be the leaders of Catholic thought should have given utterance to views which practically nullify the federation's reason for existence. It is sad to note that Their Graces of Dubuque and St. Paul have so far forgotten the encyclical *Longinque oceani* as to seek that cheap glory which is evidently the object of their addresses at the convention, when advancing years ought to warn them that they are nearing that world where, thank God, there are no Stars and Stripes and no lying Constitution to receive the adulations which involve a dangerously close kinship with heresy.

"Archbishop Keane says the federation is and ought to be non-political. If so, what is the reason for its existence? How does it expect to accomplish its purpose of applying Catholic principles to the every-day life of our own day? Is it by wasting time and money in incessant and unwieldy gatherings to resolute and resolute again?

"The word Americanism should apparently, by suggesting a certain episode which terminated in the publication of an encyclical of Leo XIII referred to above, have warned the distinguished prelate (Archbishop Ireland) to be careful; but seemingly he did not heed the warning, for he says: 'The partition of jurisdiction into the spiritual and temporal is a vital principle of Catholicism; no less is it a vital principle of Americanism. Catholicism and Americanism are in complete agreement.' And when Archbishop Ireland refers to it as a principle, 'the vital principle of Americanism,' he presents it as a definite proposition, a formal thesis, or else words have lost their meanings. Now that thesis is false, and he knows it, but talks as if he didn't for the cheap applause of brainless patriots whose allegiance to Christ and his universal kingdom must be limited and circumscribed and all but destroyed by their idiotically childish adherence to a scheme of government founded on the sophisms of Jean Jacques Rousseau and his school. The archbishop knows that our wonderful Declaration of Independence, the work of Thomas Jefferson, deist or agnostic according to the fashion of the eighteenth century, is nothing but a rehash of the *Contrat Social*, and differs but little from the famous *Declaration des Droits de l'Homme*, which was so soon to follow it in France."

To all who have studied those of the decrees and encyclicals of the last three popes relating to civil and political affairs, and

all who are also familiar with the principles of Americanism, the issue raised by the editorial is clear. There is absolutely no harmony between Catholicism and Americanism, and there never can be, for they are as opposite to each other as are the North and South Poles. If the majority vote at the Vatican Council of 1870, clothing the pope with infallibility in matters pronounced *ex cathedra*, is to be taken seriously, then every word of the editorial is in accord with the laws of the Church.

We make this statement because in a later issue of the "Morning Star," the editor-in-chief comes out with a "disavowal" of the "grossly disrespectful" editorial criticizing Archbishops Ireland and Keane. This disavowal is worded thus:

"The writer (of the first editorial), only temporarily replacing the editor, who is ill, has fallen woefully short of the confidence placed in his good judgment, and has gone far beyond the privileges of his position in thus taking unwarranted advantage of an opportunity of giving vent to his own personal feelings and opinions. He has thereby placed the responsible management of the "Morning Star" under the painful necessity of severing his connection with it forthwith, and of condemning and repudiating, as strongly as may be done by words, the grossly disrespectful and insulting language, and the whole tenor of the editorial which is so completely out of harmony with the views and sentiments of this paper."

It is to be regretted that the editor-in-chief did not make his disavowal complete, if he could and dared, by repudiating the following, in behalf of his paper and of the hierarchy in America:

1. The Syllabus of Errors of Pius IX.
2. Encyclical Letter *Inscrutabili* (1878) Leo XIII.
3. Encyclical Letter *Immortali Dei* (1885) Leo XIII.
4. Encyclical Letter *Libertas Praestantissimum* (1888) Leo XIII.
5. Encyclical Letter *Sapientiae Christianae* (1890) Leo XIII.
6. *Ne Temere* Decree (1907) Pius X.
7. Decree Against the Sillon (1910) Pius X.
8. *Motu Proprio* Decree (1911) Pius X.

The repudiation by the editor-in-chief of the offensive editorial, does in effect uphold Archbishop Ireland in saying that Americanism and Catholicism are in harmony. It is the duty then of the editor to repudiate the eight decrees above mentioned, for they all aim to enforce canon laws completely at variance with the principles of Americanism.

We are inclined to think the editor-in-chief has made a bad matter worse. He has now compelled the conviction that either the hierarchy in America is out of tune with the hierarchy at Rome or he is using deception to calm the tempest created by the objectionable editorial.

If that editorial required a disavowal, why, we ask, did not the hierarchy utter a disavowal of that treasonable To-Hell-with-the-U.-S.-Government sermon of Father Phalen, preached in his church at St. Louis and published in his "Western Watchman."

Why did not the hierarchy disavow Father Phalen's threat that

"The public man who antagonizes the Catholic Church in these days is a political suicide."—"Western Watchman," May 16, 1912.

and a similar threat by Archbishop Quigley, made in a speech reported in "The Chicago Tribune," May 5, 1903:

"In fifty years Chicago will be exclusively Catholic. The same may be said of Greater New York, and the chain of big cities stretching across the continent to San Francisco. * * * Nothing can stand against the Church. I'd like to see the politician who would try to rule against the Church in Chicago. His reign would be short indeed?"

Why did not the hierarchy disavow Archbishop Ireland's following statements?

"I wish the number of Catholic laymen holding positions of trust in our Government and occupying seats in Congress and in the Legislatures of the States were far greater than it is. * * * The Church can never have its own until this comes to pass.

(From speech at University of Detroit. Reported in N. Y. "Times," 1-28-11.)

Why did not the hierarchy disavow the action of Papal Delegate Bonzano in reviewing the Holy Name Society's parade in October, 1912, in the City of Washington, while the papal flag was displayed above the Stars and Stripes?

Why did not the hierarchy disavow the actions of those Catholics who resolved that our National hymn "America" should not be sung by Catholics, and if sung it should be hissed by those disapproving of the singing?

Yes, Mr. Editor-in-chief, if you are going to begin disavowing, when will the end be reached, especially when in *almost* every edition of some Catholic papers there appear repeated insults against our government, public schools, free press, free speech and all else that goes to make up what we term Americanism?—The Guardian of Liberty.

THE JESUITS IN SPAIN AGAIN BAFFLED

The King of Spain on January, 15th liberated Col. Juan Labrador, who, because he is a Christian, and would not as such attend a blasphemous mass service, was brought before a court-martial and by Jesuitical means cast into prison for six months. This gentleman has many years of honorable character and valiant service to his credit in the Spanish Army, and is known for his strong, godly character, and rather than dishonor the living God by bowing before Rome's dough god, he was willing to suffer for his faith. As soon as the result of the trial was known, and the colonel was imprisoned, Mr. Fowler, the secretary of the Protestant Alliance, appealed to the King of Spain, through his private secretary, and the result, as we have stated, was that the king ordered the release of the Protestant colonel. Thus Rome's intolerance receives another exposure and blow. The king got for himself the admiration due, and the good colonel comes out victor to witness for Christ and truth. The prompt action of the Protestant Alliance is most commendable. Pray God to speedily cause the light of the Gospel to break all over Spain, already awaking from the bondage in which Rome has long held her.—The Vanguard.

WHY EVANGELIZE ROMANISTS

Because, first of all, we are commanded by our Lord to preach the Gospel "to every creature." (Mark 16:15.)

Because Romanism does not teach them the real Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Because Romanism does not encourage them to read the Bible.

Because Romanism does not offer any assurance of salvation and peace with God for this life.

Because Romanism does not teach them to "come unto" Christ.

Because Romanism denies them "the right of private judgment," not only as to the Bible, but as to everything outside its own teaching.

Because Romanism thrusts itself and the hierarchy, and the Virgin Mary and saints between the sinner and the Saviour.

Because Romanism substitutes a religion of works for salvation by faith.

Because Romanism falsely gives the priests prerogative belonging only to God—that of forgiving sins.

Because Romanism continually takes money from them for Masses for the dead and other superstitious observances in which no real equivalent is rendered—that could be more usefully employed in the spread of the Gospel.

Because Romanism does not satisfy their spiritual natures, and because they are as amenable to the influences of the Gospel as any other sinners when brought face to face with it.

Because wherever the Gospel has been faithfully proclaimed in Roman Catholic lands, there have been conversions and the converts prove to be splendid Christian men and women.

"South America is cursed with a baptized paganism which has hung like a millstone round its neck for four centuries. Romanism, with its hatred and open hostility to the circulation of the Scriptures; with Mariolatry of the most debased character; with its traffic in indulgences, and its exorbitant charges for baptisms and confessions, for the marriage of the living and the burial of the dead; with the gross and general immorality of its priesthood; has reached a depth of ignorance, superstition, and filth which can find no parallel in any other continent."

REV. CHARLES INWOOD, F. R. G. S.

CHRIST'S MISSION CONTRIBUTIONS

The following contributions were received for the work of Christ's Mission from January 24, 1914, to and including February 26, 1914. Kindly inform us if any names are omitted that should be included in this list:

L. K., 50c.; Mrs. M. M., 50c.; J. J., 25c.; G. W. H., 25c.; G. C. G., 50c.; J. S. R., 50c.; H. E. S., \$15.00; Mrs. R., \$3.60; Miss F. A. B., \$3.50; W. H. B., 50c.; Mrs. S. E. E., \$1.50; Mrs. S. J. R., 50c.; S. D. L., \$10.00; G. E. W., \$1.00; J. S. S., 50c.; Mrs. A. N., \$1.00; S. J. M., \$3.65; R. N. O., \$1.00; L. J., 50c.; W. B., per Bp. F., \$96.80; O. S. S., 50c.; D. E. S., 50c.; H. M. G., 50c.; G. T. D., \$2.00; J. F., 50c.